Joint Computation and Communication Cooperation for Mobile Edge Computing

Xiaowen Cao*, Feng Wang*, Jie Xu*, Rui Zhang†, and Shuguang Cui‡
*School of Information Engineering, Guangdong University of Technology
†Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering, National University of Singapore
‡Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of California, Davis, USA
Email: caoxwen@outlook.com, fengwang.nl@gmail.com, jiexu_gdut@outlook.com, elezhang@nus.edu.sg, sgcui@ucdavis.edu

arXiv:1704.06777v1 [cs.IT] 22 Apr 2017

***Abstract*—This paper considers a three-node mobile edge computing (MEC) system that consists of a user node having latency-constrained computation tasks to be executed, a helper node, and an access point (AP) attached with an MEC server. We propose a novel *joint computation and communication cooperation* approach, where the helper uses its local computation and communication resources to help the user's task execution. In particular, we develop a four-slot protocol to enable this approach. In the first slot, the user offloads part of its tasks to the helper, such that the helper can *cooperatively compute* them on behalf of the user in the remaining time. In the second and third slots, the helper acts as a decode-and-forward (DF) relay for *cooperative communication*, in order to help the user offload another part of the tasks to the AP for remote execution. In the fourth slot, the helper and the AP send the computation results back to the user. We jointly optimize the computation and communication resource allocation at both the user and the helper, so as to minimize their total energy consumption while satisfying the user's computation latency constraint. Numerical results show that the proposed joint computation and communication cooperation approach outperforms other benchmark schemes without such a joint consideration.**

I. Introduction

Recent technological advancements have enabled various emerging applications (e.g., augmented reality and autonomous driving) that require intensive and low-latency computation at massive wireless devices [1]. As these devices are generally of small size and have limited power supply, how to provide them with enhanced computation capability and reduced computation latency is one crucial but challenging task to be tackled. Thus, mobile edge computing (MEC) has been recognized as a promising technique to provide cloud-like computing at the edge of radio access networks such as access points (APs) and base stations (BSs) by deploying MEC servers therein, such that wireless devices can offload part or all of their computation-heavy and latency-sensitive tasks to APs/BSs for remote execution at their installed MEC servers [2]–[6]. Depending on whether the computation tasks are partitionable, the computation offloading can be generally categorized into two classes, namely *binary* and *partial* offloading [3]. In binary offloading, the computation task is not partitionable, and thus should be executed as a whole via either local computing by the device itself or via offloading to the MEC server. In partial offloading, the task can be partitioned into two or more parts, which can be executed by local computing and offloading, respectively, in parallel.

Fully reaping the benefit of MEC, however, faces several design challenges. For instance, the computation capability at the MEC server and the communication capability at the AP can be fundamentally limited when the number of supported users increases; and the computation offloading in MEC systems can also be hindered when the devices are located far away from APs and the wireless channels suffer from deep fading. To overcome these issues, we notice that future wireless networks will consist of massive devices, each of which will have certain local computation and communication resources; and furthermore, at any time instance, there will always be some devices in idle mode due to the bursty nature of both computation and communication traffics. As a result, user cooperation among these devices is an efficient and viable solution, where nearby idle devices can be enabled to share their computation and communication resources to help enhance active users' computation performance in MEC.

In this paper, we investigate a new paradigm of *user cooperation in both computation and communication* for MEC. For the purpose of exposition, we consider a simplified three-node system, which consists of a user node having latency-constrained computation tasks to be executed, a helper node with both computing and communication resources, and an AP attached with an MEC server. Suppose that the computation tasks need to be executed within a time block of our interest, and partial offloading is implemented with the computation bits being arbitrarily partitionable. To implement joint computation and communication cooperation under this setup, we develop a four-slot protocol in this block. In the first slot, the user offloads part of its tasks to the helper, such that the helper can cooperatively compute them on behalf of the user in the remaining time. In the second and third slots, the helper acts as a decode-and-forward (DF) relay for cooperative communication, in order to help the user offload another part of the tasks to the AP for remote execution. In the fourth slot, the helper and the AP send the computation results back to the user. Under this setup, we pursue an energy-efficient design to minimize the total energy consumption at both the user and the helper, subject to the user's computation latency constraint. Towards this end, we jointly optimize the allocation



Fig. 1. A three-node MEC system with user cooperation.


τ_1
τ_2
τ_3
τ_4
User ⇢ Helper
User ⇢ AP/ Helper
Helper ⇢ AP
T
The fourth time slot is for the AP or the helper to send the computation results back to the user, which is ignored, i.e., $\tau_4 = 0$.

Fig. 2. Transmission protocol for MEC with user cooperation.

of time slots, the partition of the user's computation bits (for its local computing, the helper's cooperative computing, and AP's remote execution, respectively), the central process unit (CPU) frequencies at the user and the helper, as well as their transmission powers for offloading. Though this problem is non-convex in general, we transform it into a convex form and use the Lagrange duality method to obtain the optimal solution in a semi-closed form. Numerical results show that the proposed joint computation and communication cooperation approach outperforms other benchmark schemes without such a joint consideration.

It is worth noting that user cooperation has been extensively investigated in wireless communications, where nearby users can help each other in communication to improve the data rate and transmission reliability (see, e.g., [7]–[10] and the references therein). To our best knowledge, this work is the first attempt to investigate the user cooperation for MEC. More specifically, different from the sole communication cooperation in existing studies, this work pursues *joint computation and communication cooperation* by utilizing the devices' computation and communication resources for improving the MEC performance.

II. System Model and Problem Formulation

This paper considers a three-node MEC system as shown in Fig. 1, which consists of one user node, one helper node, and one AP with an MEC server integrated. The three nodes are each equipped with one single antenna. We focus on a time block with length of T, where wireless channels remain unchanged over this block, and the user needs to successfully execute a computation task with L input bits within this block (i.e., with a latency requirement of T). It is assumed that the user and the helper perfectly know the global channel state information (CSI) and computation-related information, and therefore, they can cooperatively schedule their computation and communication resources.

We consider partial offloading, and assume that the computation task can be arbitrarily partitioned into various parts to be computed in parallel [2], [3]. Specifically, the L-bit task-input data at the user are segmented into three parts with data sizes l_0, l_1, and l_2, which are for the user's local computing, offloading to the helper, and offloading to the AP, respectively. Hence, it follows that

$$l_0 + l_1 + l_2 = L. \tag{1}$$

A. Computation Offloading

In order to implement the computation offloading, the time block is divided into four slots as shown in Fig. 2. In the first slot with length of $\tau_1 \in [0, T]$, the user offloads l_1 task-input bits to the helper, and the helper can execute them in the remaining time with length of $T - \tau_1$. In the second and third slots, the helper acts as a DF relay to help the user offload l_2 task-input bits to the AP. Specifically, in the second time slot with length of $\tau_2 \in [0, T]$, the user broadcasts the offloaded bits to both the AP and the helper simultaneously; after successfully decoding these bits, in the third slot with length of $\tau_3 \in [0, T]$, the helper forwards them to the AP. Note that there is an additional fourth slot for the MEC server to execute the offloaded tasks, and for both the AP and the helper to send the computation result back to the user. As the MEC server can have sufficiently large computation capacity and the size of the computation result is much smaller than the task-input data, the fourth slot can be sufficiently short as compared to the first three slots. Therefore, we ignore the fourth slot and have the following constraint for the time slots:

$$\tau_1 + \tau_2 + \tau_3 \le T. \tag{2}$$

1) Computation Offloading to Helper: In the first slot, the user employs the transmit power P_1 for offloading the l_1-bit task-input data to the helper. Let h_{01} denote the channel power gain from the user to the helper, and B the system bandwidth. Then the achievable data rate (in bits/sec) from the user to the helper is given by

$$r_{01}(P_1) = B \log_2 \left(1 + \frac{P_1 h_{01}}{\Gamma \sigma_1^2}\right), \tag{3}$$

where σ_1^2 represents the noise power at the receiver of the helper, and $\Gamma \ge 1$ is a constant accounting for the gap from the channel capacity due to a practical coding and modulation scheme. For simplicity, $\Gamma = 1$ is assumed throughout this paper. As a result, the number of offloaded bits l_1 from the user to the helper cannot exceed the maximum number of data bits $\tau_1 r_{01}(P_1)$ for this channel, i.e.,

$$l_1 \le \tau_1 r_{01}(P_1). \tag{4}$$

We consider the transmission energy as the sole energy budget for computation offloading, and ignore the energy consumed

by circuits in the radio-frequency (RF) chains and etc. Therefore, in the first slot, the energy consumption for the user's offloading is given by

$$E_1^{\text{offl}} = \tau_1 P_1. \tag{5}$$

2) Computation Offloading to AP Assisted by Helper: In the second and third slots, the helper acts as a DF relay to help the user offload l_2 task-input bits to the AP. In the second slot, let P_2 denote the transmit power of the user. In this case, the achievable data rate from the user to the helper is given by $r_{01}(P_2)$ with $r_{01}(\cdot)$ defined in (3). By denoting h_0 as the channel power gain from the user to the AP, the achievable data rate from the user to the AP is

$$r_0(P_2) = B\log_2\left(1+\frac{P_2 h_0}{\sigma_0^2}\right), \tag{6}$$

where σ_0^2 is the noise power at the AP receiver.

In the third time slot, the helper forwards the successfully decoded bits to the AP by setting the transmit power as P_3. Let h_1 be the channel power gain from the helper to the AP. The achievable data rate from the helper to the AP is

$$r_1(P_3) = B\log_2\left(1+\frac{P_3 h_1}{\sigma_0^2}\right). \tag{7}$$

By combining the two slots and based on [9], the maximum number of data bits that can be transmitted from the user to the AP via the DF relay (the helper) is given as $\min\left(\tau_2 r_0(P_2)+\tau_3 r_1(P_3),\ \tau_2 r_{01}(P_2)\right)$, which is the upper bound for the number of the offloaded bits l_2 to the AP, i.e.,

$$l_2 \le \min\left(\tau_2 r_0(P_2)+\tau_3 r_1(P_3),\ \tau_2 r_{01}(P_2)\right). \tag{8}$$

Similarly as for (5), the offloading energy consumption by the user in the second slot and that by the helper in the third slot are expressed as, respectively,

$$E_2^{\text{offl}} = \tau_2 P_2 \tag{9}$$

$$E_3^{\text{offl}} = \tau_3 P_3. \tag{10}$$

B. Computing at User and Helper

1) Local Computing at User: The user is responsible to execute the computation task with l_0 input bits over the block with a length of T. Let c_0 and $f_{0,n}$ denote the number of CPU cycles for computing one bit at the user and the CPU frequency for the n-th CPU cycle, respectively. As all the local computing should be accomplished before the end of the time block, we have the following computation latency requirement:

$$\sum_{n=1}^{c_0 l_0} \frac{1}{f_{0,n}} \le T. \tag{11}$$

Accordingly, the user's energy consumption for local computing is [3]

$$E_0^{\text{comp}} = \sum_{n=1}^{c_0 l_0} \kappa_0 f_{0,n}^2, \tag{12}$$

where κ_0 denotes the effective capacitance coefficient that depends on the chip architecture at the user. It has been shown in [6, Lemma 1] that in order to save energy while minimizing the computation latency, it is optimal to set the CPU frequencies to be identical for different CPU cycles. By using this fact and letting the constraint in (11) be met with strict equality, we have $f_{0,1} = f_{0,2} = ... = f_{0,c_0 l_0} = c_0 l_0/T$. Substituting this in (12), the energy consumption E_0^{loc} is re-expressed as

$$E_0^{\text{comp}} = \frac{\kappa_0 c_0^3 l_0^3}{T^2}. \tag{13}$$

2) Cooperative Computing at Helper: After receiving the offloaded l_1 task input bits in the first time slot, the helper executes the task during the remaining time with a length of $T-\tau_1$. Let c_1 and $f_{1,n}$ be the number of CPU cycles for computing one bit at the user and the CPU frequency for the n-th CPU cycle, respectively. Similarly as for the local computing at the user, we set the CPU frequency for each CPU cycle as $f_{1,n} = c_1 l_1/(T-\tau_1)$, $\forall n \in \{1,\ldots,c_1 l_1\}$. Accordingly, the energy consumption for the cooperative computation at the helper is

$$E_1^{\text{comp}} = \frac{\kappa_1 c_1^3 l_1^3}{(T-\tau_1)^2}, \tag{14}$$

where κ_1 is the effective capacitance coefficient of the helper.

C. Problem Formulation

We are particularly interested in the energy efficiency at the wireless device side, and thus omit the energy consumption by the MEC server at the AP for executing the offloaded l_2-bit task.[1] We aim to minimize the total energy consumption at both the user and the helper, by jointly optimizing their computation and communication resource allocation, while satisfying the user's computation latency constraint. In particular, the decision variables include the allocation of the time slots $\boldsymbol{\tau} = [\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3]$, the partition of the computation bits $\boldsymbol{l} = [l_0, l_1, l_2]$, and the power allocations $\boldsymbol{P} = [P_1, P_2, P_3]$. Mathematically, the energy-efficient joint computation and communication cooperation problem is formulated as

$$(\text{P1}):\ \min_{\boldsymbol{P},\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{l}}\ \sum_{i=1}^{3}\tau_i P_i + \frac{\kappa_0 c_0^3 l_0^3}{T^2} + \frac{\kappa_1 c_1^3 l_1^3}{(T-\tau_1)^2} \tag{15a}$$

$$\text{s.t. } P_i \ge 0,\ 0 \le \tau_i \le T,\quad \forall i \in \{1,2,3\} \tag{15b}$$

$$l_j \ge 0,\quad \forall j \in \{0,1,2\}, \tag{15c}$$

$$(1),\ (2),\ (4),\ \text{and } (8),$$

where (1) and (2) denote the partition of the computation bits and the constraints on the offloading time allocation, respectively; (4) and (8) ensure that the numbers of the offloaded bits from the user to the helper and the AP are limited by the achievable data rates of the respective channels, respectively. Note that problem (P1) is non-convex in general due to the coupling of τ_i and P_i in the objective function (15a) and the constraints (4) and (8).

III. Optimal Solution to Problem (P1)

This section presents the optimal solution to problem (P1). Towards this end, we first transform (P1) into a convex form by introducing a set of auxiliary variables $\boldsymbol{E} = [E_1, E_2, E_3]$ with $E_i \triangleq P_i\tau_i, \forall i \in \{1,2,3\}$. Then we have $P_i = E_i/\tau_i$, where

[1] As the AP normally has reliable power supply and sufficient computation capability, its energy consumption is not the bottleneck of the MEC system.

to avoid division by zero, we define $P_i = 0$ if either $E_i = 0$ or $\tau_i = 0$ holds, $\forall i \in \{1,2,3\}$. By substituting $P_i = E_i/\tau_i$, $\forall i \in \{1,2,3\}$, problem (P1) can be reformulated as

$$(\text{P1.1}): \min_{\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{l}} \sum_{i=1}^{3} E_i + \frac{\kappa_0 c_0^3 l_0^3}{T^2} + \frac{\kappa_1 c_1^3 l_1^3}{(T-\tau_1)^2} \tag{16a}$$

$$\text{s.t. } l_1 \le \tau_1 r_{01}\left(\frac{E_1}{\tau_1}\right) \tag{16b}$$

$$l_2 \le \tau_2 r_0\left(\frac{E_2}{\tau_2}\right) + \tau_3 r_1\left(\frac{E_3}{\tau_3}\right) \tag{16c}$$

$$l_2 \le \tau_2 r_{01}\left(\frac{E_2}{\tau_2}\right) \tag{16d}$$

$$(1),\ (2),\ (15b),\ \text{and } (15c),$$

where the two constraints (16c) and (16d) follow from (8). Note that for any $j \in \{0,1,01\}$, the function $r_j(x)$ is a concave function with respect to $x \ge 0$, and therefore, its perspective function $\tau_i r_j\left(\frac{E_i}{\tau_i}\right)$ is jointly concave with respect to $\tau_i \ge 0$ and $E_i \ge 0$ [12]. As a result, the three constraints in (16b), (16c), and (16d) become convex. Furthermore, note that the function l^3/τ^2 is jointly convex with respect to $l \ge 0$ and $\tau > 0$, and hence the term $\frac{\kappa_1 c_1^3 l_1^3}{(T-\tau_1)^2}$ in the objective function is jointly convex with respect to l_1 and τ_1. It thus follows that problem (P1.1) is a convex problem, which can be efficiently solved by standard convex optimization techniques such as the interior-point method [12]. Nevertheless, to gain more insights, in the following we leverage the Lagrange duality method [12] to obtain a semi-closed-form solution.

Let λ_1, λ_2, and λ_3 denote the non-negative Lagrange multipliers associated with the constraints in (16b), (16c), and (16d), respectively, and $\mu_1 \ge 0$ and μ_2 denote the Lagrange multipliers associated with the constraints in (1) and (2), respectively. For notational convenience, we denote $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = [\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3]$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu} = [\mu_1, \mu_2]$. The partial Lagrangian of (P1.1) is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{l},\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}) \\
&= E_1 + \mu_1\tau_1 + \frac{\kappa_1 c_1^3 l_1^3}{(T-\tau_1)^2} + (\lambda_1-\mu_2)l_1 + \lambda_1\tau_1 r_{01}\left(\frac{E_1}{\tau_1}\right) \\
&\quad + E_2 - \lambda_2\tau_2 r_0\left(\frac{E_2}{\tau_2}\right) - \lambda_3\tau_2 r_{01}\left(\frac{E_2}{\tau_2}\right) + \mu_1\tau_2 \\
&\quad + E_3 - \lambda_2\tau_3 r_1\left(\frac{E_3}{\tau_3}\right) + \mu_1\tau_3 \\
&\quad + \frac{\kappa_0 c_0^3 l_0^3}{T^2} - \mu_2 l_0 + (\lambda_2+\lambda_3-\mu_2)l_2 - \mu_1 T + \mu_2 L.
\end{aligned}$$

Then the dual function of problem (P1.1) is

$$g(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \min_{\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{l}} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{E},\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{l},\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}) \quad \text{s.t. (15b) and (15c).} \tag{17}$$

Consequently, the dual problem of (P1.1) is

$$(\text{D1.1}): \max_{\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}} \ g(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}) \quad \text{s.t. } \mu_1 \ge 0,\ \lambda_i \ge 0, \forall i \in \{1,2,3\}. \tag{18}$$

Since problem (P1.1) is convex and satisfies the Slater's condition, strong duality holds between (P1.1) and (D1.1) [12]. As a result, one can solve (P1.1) by equivalently solving its dual problem (D1.1). In the following, we first obtain the dual function $g(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})$ for any given $(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})$, and then obtain the optimal dual variables to maximize $g(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})$. For convenience of presentation, we denote $(\boldsymbol{E}^*,\boldsymbol{\tau}^*,\boldsymbol{l}^*)$ as the optimal solution to problem (17) under the given $(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})$, $(\boldsymbol{E}^{\text{opt}},\boldsymbol{\tau}^{\text{opt}},\boldsymbol{l}^{\text{opt}})$ as the optimal primal solution to (P1.1), and $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\text{opt}},\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\text{opt}})$ as the optimal dual solution to (D1.1).

A. Derivation of Dual Function $g(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})$

Lemma 3.1: In order for $g(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})$ to be bounded from below, it must hold that

$$\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \mu_2 \ge 0. \tag{19}$$

Proof: See Appendix A. ∎

For notational convenience, we denote $\mathcal{X}$ as the set of $(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})$ characterized by the constraints in (18) and (19). Then, we obtain $g(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})$ by solving problem (17) under any given $(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathcal{X}$. In this case, problem (17) can be decomposed into five subproblems as follows.

$$\min_{E_1,\tau_1,l_1} E_1 + \mu_1\tau_1 - \lambda_1\tau_1 r_{01}\left(\frac{E_1}{\tau_1}\right) + (\lambda_1-\mu_2)l_1 + \frac{\kappa_1 c_1^3 l_1^3}{(T-\tau_1)^2}$$
$$\text{s.t. } E_1 \ge 0,\ \ T \ge \tau_1 \ge 0,\ \ l_1 \ge 0 \tag{20}$$

$$\min_{E_2\ge 0,\ 0\le\tau_2\le T} E_2 + \mu_1\tau_2 - \lambda_2\tau_2 r_0\left(\frac{E_2}{\tau_2}\right) - \lambda_3\tau_2 r_{01}\left(\frac{E_2}{\tau_2}\right) \tag{21}$$

$$\min_{E_3\ge 0,\ 0\le\tau_3\le T} E_3 + \mu_1\tau_3 - \lambda_2\tau_3 r_1\left(\frac{E_3}{\tau_3}\right) \tag{22}$$

$$\min_{l_0\ge 0} \quad \frac{\kappa_0 c_0^3 l_0^3}{T^2} - \mu_2 l_0 \tag{23}$$

$$\min_{l_2\ge 0} \quad (\lambda_2+\lambda_3-\mu_2)l_2 \tag{24}$$

We present the optimal solutions to problems (20)–(24) in Lemmas 3.2–3.6 in the following. As these lemmas can be similarly proved, we only show the proof of Lemma 3.2 and omit the proofs of Lemmas 3.3–3.6 for brevity.

Lemma 3.2: Under given $(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\tau}) \in \mathcal{X}$, the optimal solution (E_1^*,τ_1^*,l_1^*) to problem (20) satisfies

$$E_1^* = P_1^*\tau_1^*, \tag{25}$$

$$l_1^* = M_1^*(T-\tau_1^*), \tag{26}$$

$$\tau_1^* \begin{cases} = T, & \text{if} \quad \rho_1 < 0, \\ \in [0,T], & \text{if} \quad \rho_1 = 0, \\ = 0, & \text{if} \quad \rho_1 > 0, \end{cases} \tag{27}$$

where $P_1^* = \left(\frac{\lambda_1 B}{\ln 2} - \frac{\sigma_1^2}{h_{01}}\right)^+$ with $(x)^+ \triangleq \max(x,0)$, and

$$M_1^* = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\frac{\mu_2-\lambda_1}{3\kappa_1 c_1^3}}, & \text{if } \mu_2-\lambda_1 \ge 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } \mu_2-\lambda_1 < 0, \end{cases} \tag{28}$$

$$\rho_1 = \mu_1 + P_1^* - \lambda_1 r_{01}(P_1^*) + \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{9}\sqrt{\frac{(\mu_2-\lambda_1)^3}{\kappa_1 c_1^3}}. \tag{29}$$

Proof: See Appendix B. ∎

Lemma 3.3: Under given $(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\tau})\in\mathcal{X}$, the optimal solution (E_2^*,τ_2^*) to problem (21) satisfies

$$E_2^*=\tau_2^*P_2^*, \tag{30}$$

$$\tau_2^*\begin{cases}=T, & \text{if} \quad \rho_2<0,\\ \in[0,T], & \text{if} \quad \rho_2=0,\\ =0, & \text{if} \quad \rho_2>0,\end{cases} \tag{31}$$

where $P_2^*=\left(\frac{\sqrt{v^2-4uw}-v}{2u}\right)^+$ with $u=\frac{\ln 2}{B}\frac{h_0}{\sigma_0^2}\frac{h_{01}}{\sigma_1^2}$, $v=\frac{\ln 2}{B}(\frac{h_0}{\sigma_0^2}+\frac{h_{01}}{\sigma_1^2})-(\lambda_2+\lambda_3)\frac{h_0}{\sigma_0^2}\frac{h_{01}}{\sigma_1^2}$, $w=\frac{\ln 2}{B}-\lambda_2\frac{h_0}{\sigma_0^2}-\lambda_3\frac{h_{01}}{\sigma_1^2}$, and $\rho_2=\mu_1-\lambda_2 r_0(P_2^*)+\frac{\lambda_2 BP_2^*\frac{h_0}{\sigma_0^2}}{(1+P_2^*\frac{h_0}{\sigma_0^2})\ln 2}-\lambda_3 r_{01}(P_2^*)+\frac{\lambda_3 BP_2^*\frac{h_{01}}{\sigma_1^2}}{(1+P_2^*\frac{h_{01}}{\sigma_1^2})\ln 2}$.

Lemma 3.4: Under given $(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\tau})\in\mathcal{X}$, the optimal solution (E_3^*,τ_3^*) to problem (22) satisfies

$$E_3^*=P_3^*\tau_3^*, \tag{32}$$

$$\tau_3^*\begin{cases}=T, & \text{if} \quad \rho_3<0,\\ \in[0,T], & \text{if} \quad \rho_3=0,\\ =0, & \text{if} \quad \rho_3>0,\end{cases} \tag{33}$$

where $P_3^*=\left(\frac{\lambda_2 B}{\ln 2}-\frac{\sigma_0^2}{h_1}\right)^+$ and $\rho_3=\mu_1+P_3^*-\lambda_2 r_1(P_3^*)$.

Lemma 3.5: For given $(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\tau})\in\mathcal{X}$, the optimal solution l_0^* to problem (23) is

$$l_0^*=T\sqrt{\frac{\mu_2}{3\kappa_0 c_0^3}}. \tag{34}$$

Lemma 3.6: For given $(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\tau})\in\mathcal{X}$, the optimal solution l_2^* to problem (24) is

$$l_2^*\begin{cases}=0, & \text{if} \quad \lambda_2+\lambda_3-\mu_2>0,\\ \in[0,\infty), & \text{if} \quad \lambda_2+\lambda_3-\mu_2=0.\end{cases} \tag{35}$$

Note that in (27), (31), (33), or (35), if $\rho_i=0$ (for any $i\in\{1,2,3\}$) or $\lambda_2+\lambda_3-\mu_2=0$, then the optimal solution τ_i^* or l_2^* is non-unique in general. In this case, we choose $\tau_i^*=0$ and $l_2^*=0$ here for the purpose of evaluating the dual function $g(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})$, though such choices may not be feasible or optimal for the original problem (P1.1). To tackle this issue, we will use an additional step in Section III-C later to find the primary optimal $\tau_i^{\rm opt}$'s and $l_2^{\rm opt}$ for (P1.1).

By combining Lemmas 3.2–3.6, the dual function $g(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})$ is obtained for any given $(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})\in\mathcal{X}$.

B. Obtaining $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\rm opt}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\rm opt}$ to Maximize $g(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})$

Next, we search over $(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})\in\mathcal{X}$ to maximize $g(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})$ for solving (D1.1). Since the dual function $g(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})$ is concave but non-differentiable in general, we can use subgradient based methods, such as the ellipsoid method [11], to obtain the optimal $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\rm opt}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\rm opt}$ for (D1.1). Note that for the objective function in (17), the subgradient with respect to $(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})$ is

$$\left[l_1^*-\tau_1^* r_{01}\left(\frac{E_1^*}{\tau_1^*}\right), l_2^*-\tau_2^* r_0\left(\frac{E_2^*}{\tau_2^*}\right)-\tau_3^* r_1\left(\frac{E_3^*}{\tau_3^*}\right),\right.$$
$$\left. l_2^*-\tau_2^* r_{01}\left(\frac{E_2^*}{\tau_2^*}\right), \tau_1^*+\tau_2^*+\tau_3^*-T, L-l_0^*-l_1^*-l_2^*\right].$$

For the constraints $\mu_1\geq 0$ and $\lambda_i\geq 0$, the subgradients are $\boldsymbol{e}_4$ and $\boldsymbol{e}_i$, $\forall i\in\{1,2,3\}$, respectively, where $\boldsymbol{e}_i$ is the standard unit vector with one in the i-th entry and zeros elsewhere in $\mathbb{R}^5$. In addition, for the constraint in (19), the subgradient is expressed as $[0,1,1,0,-1]$.

C. Optimal Solution to (P1)

With $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\rm opt}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\rm opt}$ obtained, it remains to determine the optimal solution to (P1.1) (and thus (P1)). By replacing $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ in Lemmas 3.2–3.6 as $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\rm opt}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\rm opt}$, we denote the corresponding P_i^*'s, l_0^*, and M_1^* as $P_i^{\rm opt}$'s, $l_0^{\rm opt}$, and $M_1^{\rm opt}$, respectively. Here, $\boldsymbol{P}^{\rm opt}=[P_1^{\rm opt},P_2^{\rm opt},P_3^{\rm opt}]$ corresponds to the optimal solution of $\boldsymbol{P}$ to (P1), and $l_0^{\rm opt}$ corresponds to the optimal solution of l_0 to both (P1) and (P1.1). Nevertheless, due to the non-uniqueness of τ_i^*'s and l_2^*, we need an additional step to construct the optimal solution of other variables to (P1). Fortunately, with $\boldsymbol{P}^{\rm opt}$, $M_1^{\rm opt}$, and $l_0^{\rm opt}$ obtained, we know that the optimal solution must satisfy $l_1=M_1^{\rm opt}(T-\tau_1)$ and $E_i=P_i^{\rm opt}\tau_i,\forall i\in\{1,2,3\}$. By substituting them in problem (P1) or (P1.1), we have the following linear program (LP) to obtain $\boldsymbol{\tau}^{\rm opt}$, $l_1^{\rm opt}$, and $l_2^{\rm opt}$.

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\tau},l_1\geq 0,l_2\geq 0}\ \sum_{i=1}^{3}\tau_i P_i^{\rm opt}+\kappa_1(c_1M_1^{\rm opt})^3(T-\tau_1) \tag{36}$$
$$\text{s.t. } l_1\leq\tau_1 r_{01}(P_1^{\rm opt})$$
$$l_2\leq\tau_2 r_0(P_2^{\rm opt})+\tau_3 r_1(P_3^{\rm opt})$$
$$l_2\leq\tau_2 r_{01}(P_2^{\rm opt})$$
$$l_1+l_2=L-l_0^{\rm opt}$$
$$(2) \text{ and } 0\leq\tau_i\leq T,\ \forall i\in\{1,2,3\}$$

The LP in (36) can be efficiently solved by the standard interior-point method [12]. By combining $\boldsymbol{\tau}^{\rm opt}$, $l_1^{\rm opt}$, and $l_2^{\rm opt}$ here, together with $\boldsymbol{P}^{\rm opt}$ and $l_0^{\rm opt}$, the optimal solution to (P1) is finally found.

In summary, Algorithm 1 for solving the joint computation and communication cooperation problem (P1) is given below.

Algorithm 1 *for Solving Problem* (P1)

a) Initialization: Given an ellipsoid $\mathcal{E}((\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu}),\boldsymbol{A})$ containing $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\rm opt},\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\rm opt})$, where $(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})$ is the center point of $\mathcal{E}$ and the positive definite matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ characterizes the size of $\mathcal{E}$.
b) **Repeat:**
   1) Obtain $\boldsymbol{P}^*,\boldsymbol{E}^*,\boldsymbol{\tau}^*$, and $\boldsymbol{l}^*$ with $(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})\in\mathcal{X}$ according to Lemmas 3.2–3.6;
   2) Compute the subgradients of $g(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})$, then update $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ using the ellipsoid method [11].
c) **Until** $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ converge with a prescribed accuracy.
d) **Set** $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\rm opt},\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\rm opt})\leftarrow(\boldsymbol{\lambda},\boldsymbol{\mu})$.
e) **Output**: Obtain $\boldsymbol{P}^{\rm opt}$ and $l_0^{\rm opt}$ based on Lemmas 3.2–3.5 by replacing $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ as $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{\rm opt}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\rm opt}$, and then compute $\boldsymbol{\tau}^{\rm opt}$, $l_1^{\rm opt}$, and $l_2^{\rm opt}$ by solving the LP in (36).

IV. Numerical Results

In this section, we present numerical results to validate the performance of the proposed joint computation and communication cooperation design, as compared to the following four benchmark schemes without such a joint consideration:



Fig. 3. The total energy consumption versus the time block length.



Fig. 4. The total energy consumption versus the number of computation bits.



Fig. 5. The total energy consumption versus the distance between the user and the helper.

1) Computation cooperation only: The user can perform local computing and offload its task to the helper for cooperative computation only, while no computation offloading to AP is available. This corresponds to solving problem (P1) by setting $l_2 = 0$ and $l_1 + l_0 = L$.

2) Local computing only: The user accomplishes its computation task via local computing only. This corresponds to $l_1 = l_2 = 0$ and $l_0 = L$. In this case, the user's energy consumption for local computing is given as $E_0^{\rm comp} = \frac{\kappa_0 c_0^3 L^3}{T^2}$.

3) Communication cooperation only: The user can only offload its computation task to the AP assisted by the helper's communication cooperation. This corresponds to solving problem (P1) by setting $l_2 = L$ and $\tau_2 + \tau_3 = T$.

4) Offloading to AP only: The user offloads all the computation task with L input bits to the AP via direct-link transmission. This corresponds to $l_2 = L$ and $\tau_2 = T$. In this case, the user's energy consumption $E^{\rm offl}$ for offloading to the AP is given as $E_2^{\rm offl} = (2^{\frac{L}{TB}} - 1)T\sigma_0^2/h_0$.

In the simulation, we consider a particular scenario when the distance between the AP and the user is 250 meters (m), and the helper is located in the line segment between them, where $0 \leq D \leq 250$m denotes the distance between the user and the helper.[2] For the wireless transmission, the path-loss model is given as $\text{PL}_0 \times \left(\frac{d}{d_0}\right)^{-\zeta}$, where d denotes the distance between the transmitter and the receiver, the path-loss exponent is set as $\zeta = 3$, and $\text{PL}_0 = -60$ dB denotes the path-loss corresponding to a reference distance of $d_0 = 10$m. In addition, we set the bandwidth as $B = 1$ MHz, the noise powers at the receivers of the helper and the AP as $\sigma_0^2 = \sigma_1^2 = -80$ dBm. Furthermore, we have $c_1 = c_0 = 10^3$ cycles/bit and $\kappa_1 = \kappa_0 = 10^{-28}$ [4].

Fig. 3 shows the total energy consumption versus the length of a time block for different schemes, where $L = 0.22$ Mbits and $D = 130$m. It is observed that the computation-cooperation-only scheme achieves lower energy consumption than the local-computing-only scheme, and the communication-cooperation-only scheme outperforms the offloading-to-AP-only scheme. This is intuitive and shows the benefit of computation and communication cooperations, respectively. It is also observed that the proposed design achieves the lowest energy consumption among all the five schemes, by efficiently exploiting both advantages. Furthermore, when the time block length T is small (e.g., $T \leq 0.15$ sec), the offloading-to-AP-only scheme outperforms the local-computing-only scheme, and the communication-cooperation-only scheme achieves a better performance than the computation-cooperation-only scheme. When the time block length becomes large, the opposite is true, and the proposed design achieves a similar performance as the computation-cooperation-only scheme. This shows that offloading (with or without cooperation) is more beneficial than local computing in the small T case, and vice versa.

Fig. 4 depicts the total energy consumption versus the number of computation bits L, where $T = 0.05$ sec and $D = 130$m. It is observed that the communication-cooperation-only scheme outperforms the computation-cooperation-only scheme at small L values (e.g., $L < 0.4$ Mbits), while the opposite is true at larger L values. This indicates that the user prefers offloading than local computing when L is small in this setup,

[2]In practice, the helper should be located between the user and the AP for efficient communication cooperation. Such a helper can be practically found via efficient helper selection among various wireless devices.

and vice versa.

Fig. 5 shows the total energy consumption versus the distance D between the user and the helper, with $T = 0.05$ sec and $L = 0.3$ Mbits. It is observed that the total energy consumptions achieved by both the offloading-to-AP-only and the local-computing-only schemes remain unchanged as D varies, since both schemes do not involve the helper's participation. It is also observed that the total energy consumption by the communication-cooperation-only scheme first decreases and then increases as D increases, while that by the computation-cooperation-only scheme monotonically increases. This is due to the fact that with increasing D, the wireless channel between the user and the helper becomes weaker, while that between the helper and the AP becomes stronger. This benefits the offloading from the helper to the AP, but incurs increased offloading energy consumption from the user to the helper. For this reason, the computation-cooperation-only scheme is observed to perform superior to the communication-cooperation-only scheme at smaller D values (e.g., $D < 50$m), while the computation-cooperation-only scheme performs inferior at large D values. In addition, the proposed joint cooperation is observed to achieve significant gains in energy consumption reduction at all D values.

V. Conclusion

In this paper, we investigated a new joint computation and communication cooperation approach in a simplified three-node MEC system, where a nearby helper node is enabled to share its computation and communication resources to help improve the MEC performance. We proposed a four-slot protocol to enable this approach and developed a new energy-efficient design framework to minimize the total energy consumption at both the user and the helper, by jointly scheduling their computation and communication resources. It is our hope that this paper can open a new avenue in exploring the multi-resource user cooperation to improve the computation performance for MEC.

Appendix

A. Proof of Lemma 3.1

Note that for $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{l}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ in (17), there exists one term $(\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \mu_2)l_2$. Suppose $\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \mu_2 < 0$. Then $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{E}, \boldsymbol{\tau}, \boldsymbol{l}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ becomes negative infinity when $l_2 \to +\infty$. This implies that the dual function $g(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ is unbounded from below in this case. Hence, it requires that $\lambda_2 + \lambda_3 - \mu_2 \geq 0$ to guarantee $g(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ to be bounded from below.

B. Proof of Lemma 3.2

As problem (20) is a convex optimization problem and satisfies the Slater's condition, the strong duality for (20) and its Lagrange dual problem holds. Therefore, we solve this problem by the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions [12]. The Lagrangian of problem (20) is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_1 =& E_1 + \mu_1\tau_1 - \lambda_1\tau_1 r_{01}(\frac{E_1}{\tau_1}) - \mu_2 l_1 + \lambda_1 l_1 + \frac{\kappa_1 c_1^3 l_1^3}{(T-\tau_1)^2} \\ & - a_1 E_1 - b_1\tau_1 + c_1(\tau_1 - T) - d_1 l_1,\end{aligned}$$

where a_1, b_1, c_1 and d_1 are the non-negative Lagrange multipliers associated with $E_1 \geq 0, \tau_1 \geq 0$, $T \geq \tau_1$ and $l_1 \geq 0$, respectively. Based on the KKT conditions, it follows that

$$a_1 E_1 = 0, \quad b_1\tau_1 = 0, \quad c_1(\tau_1 - T) = 0, \quad d_1 l_1 = 0 \tag{37a}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_1}{\partial E_1} = 1 - \frac{\lambda_1 B \frac{h_{01}}{\sigma_1^2}}{\ln 2\left(1+\frac{E_1}{\tau_1}\frac{h_{01}}{\sigma_1^2}\right)} - a_1 = 0 \tag{37b}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_1}{\partial \tau_1} =& \frac{2\kappa_1 c_1^3 l_1^3}{(T-\tau_1)^3} + \mu_1 - \lambda_1 B \log_2\left(1 + \frac{E_1}{\tau_1}\frac{h_{01}}{\sigma_1^2}\right) \\ & + \frac{\lambda_1 B \frac{h_{01}}{\sigma^2}\frac{E_1}{\tau_1}}{\ln 2\left(1+\frac{E_1}{\tau_1}\frac{h_{01}}{\sigma_1^2}\right)} - b_1 + c_1 = 0\end{aligned} \tag{37c}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_1}{\partial l_1} = \frac{3\kappa_1 c_1^3 l_1^2}{(T-\tau_1)^2} - \mu_2 + \lambda_1 - d_1 = 0, \tag{37d}$$

where (37a) denotes the complementary slackness condition, and (37b), (37c) and (37d) are the first-order derivative conditions of $\mathcal{L}_1$ with respect to E_1, τ_1 and l_1, respectively. From (37b), the relation between E_1 and τ_1 is given in (25). From (37d), we obtain (26).

Furthermore, by substituting $\frac{E_1^*}{\tau_1^*}$ and l_1^* into (37c) and assuming $\rho_1 \triangleq b_1 - c_1$, we have ρ_1 in (29). Hence, the optimal τ_1^* is given in (27). Therefore, this lemma is finally proved.

References

[1] M. Chiang and T. Zhang, "Fog and IoT: An overview of research opportunities," *IEEE Internet Thing J.* vol. 3, no. 6, pp. 854–864, Jun. 2016.

[2] S. Barbarossa, S. Sardellitti, and P. D. Lorenzo, "Communicating while computing: Distributed mobile cloud computing over 5G heterogeneous networks," *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, vol. 31. no. 6, pp. 45–55, Nov. 2014.

[3] Y. Mao, C. You, J. Zhang, K. Huang, and K. B. Letaief, "Mobile edge computing: Survey and research outlook," [Online] Available: https://arxiv.org/pdf/1701.01090

[4] C. You, K. Huang, H. Chae, and B. -H. Kim, "Energy-efficient resource allocation for mobile-edge computing offloading," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 1397-1411, Mar. 2017.

[5] M. Chen, B. Liang, and M. Dong, "Joint offloading decision and resource allocation for multi-user multi-task mobile cloud," in *Proc. IEEE ICC*, Kuala Lumpur, Maylasia, May 2016, pp. 1–6.

[6] F. Wang, J. Xu, X. Wang, and S. Cui, "Joint offloading and computing optimization in wireless powered mobile-edge computing system," to appear in *Proc. IEEE ICC 2017*. [Online] Available: https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.00606

[7] J. N. Laneman, D. Tse, and G. W. Wornell, "Cooperative diversity in wireless networks: Efficient protocols and outage behavior, " *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 50, no. 11, pp. 3062–3080, Nov. 2004.

[8] A. Sendonaris, E. Erkip, and B. Aazhang, "User cooperation diversity: Part I. system description," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 51, no. 11, pp. 1927–1938, Nov. 2003.

[9] Y. Liang and V. V. Veeravalli, "Gaussian orthogonal relay channels: Optimal resource allocation and capacity," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 9, pp. 3284-3289, Sep. 2005.

[10] H. Ju and R. Zhang, "User cooperation in wireless powered communication networks," in *Proc. IEEE GLOBECOM*, Austin, TX, USA, Dec. 2014, pp. 1430-1435.

[11] S. Boyd, "Ellipsoid method," Stanford University, California, USA. [Online] Available: https://web.stanford.edu/class/ee364b/lectures/ellipsoid_method_slides.pdf

[12] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*, Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, Mar. 2004.